

## **FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES**

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 17, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:                Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
                             Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
                             Ally Miller, Member  
                             \*Steve Christy, Member  
                             Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present:        Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
                             Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
                             Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
                             Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

### **1. CONTRACT**

Sunset Acres II Homeowners' Association, to provide for an Agreement to Donate Real Property and Special Warranty Deed, Tax Parcel No. 101-06-0560, located on the east side of Silverbell Road, across from West Sunset Dunes Place, in Section 7, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, Flood Control Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$1,400.00 for closing costs (CT-PW-21-220)

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Villegas and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

### **2. CONTRACT**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Transportation Authority, Amendment No. 2, to provide a Memorandum of Agreement to expedite Section 404 review, evaluation and permitting of Regional Flood Control District and Pima County projects, extend contract term to 12/31/24 and amend contractual language, Flood Control Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$251,928.00 (CT-FC-12-1947)

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Villegas and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

DRAFT

## ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 17, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
Ally Miller, Member  
\*Steve Christy, Member  
Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

### 1. ORDER AND CALL FOR ELECTION

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - RK4, of the District Board of Rocking K South Community Facilities District ordering and calling an election with respect to increasing the rate of levy of an ad valorem property tax attributable to the operation and maintenance expenses of the district.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Bronson to adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Miller inquired about the conveyance of infrastructure costs.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that community facility districts were allowed to build public infrastructure and those elements would be conveyed to the County when financed by the developer, investor or bank supported developer. He added that the infrastructure had to be built to County standards.

Supervisor Miller expressed concern that Rocking K residents would be paying for the infrastructure via a tax levy and County taxpayers would in turn pay for the maintenance if the conveyance was approved. She stated that because of the County's \$16 million loan to Rocking K and the collection of impact fees to pay for the loan the conveyance should not be granted. She indicated that she would not support the resolution.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Miller voted "Nay."

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

DRAFT

## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 17, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
Ally Miller, Member  
\*Steve Christy, Member  
Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

### 1. **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

A Moment of Silence was observed by those in attendance.

### 2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION**

### 3. Presentation of a proclamation to Corporal Miguel Sandoval, Toys for Tots Coordinator, proclaiming the month of December 2020 to be: "TOYS FOR TOTS COLLECTION MONTH"

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Villegas made the presentation.

### 4. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Annie Ovitz, LD2 Captain, 227 Green Valley, asked that the Board audit the paper ballots prior to certification.

Roger Score addressed the Board in opposition to the mask mandate, and government shutdowns and he asked that a vote recount be conducted.

Cindy Walton-Sparks questioned the validity of the 2020 election results and asked that a recount audit of the paper ballots be conducted.

Chairman Valadez read a comment for the record from Bambi Corso who asked the Board for a forensic audit of County votes for President, Senator and Proposition 208.

Peter Norquest spoke to the Board about the criterion used by the County for communicating policy decisions regarding lockdowns, PPE mandates and other COVID-19 related matters.

Dru Heaton spoke to the Board about Monsanto and the preservation of civil liberties.

## **CLERK OF THE BOARD**

### **5. Petitions for Redemption of Property Tax Exemption Waiver**

Staff recommends approval of the petitions for redemption of property tax exemption waivers.

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

## **ELECTIONS**

### **6. Canvass**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-642(A), canvass of the election results for the November 3, 2020, General Election.

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Villegas to canvass the election. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Miller discussed some of the concern that occurred in Maricopa County related to the used of felt-tip pens and inquired how similar issues were handled by the County.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, asked the Elections Director to provide clarification on how duplicate ballots were evaluated and what happened to ballots rejected by the tabulation machines.

Brad Nelson, Director, Elections Department, responded that scanners were not utilized at the precincts. He explained that individuals received their ballots after providing the necessary identification and signing the roster. He stated that they were then directed to a privacy booth to complete their voting. He indicated that completed ballots were placed into receptacles, not into electronic devices, and were returned to the election headquarters to be counted. He stated that if an over-

vote occurred or the scanner was unable to read the ballot, a process for duplication was available. He added that if a determination could not be made on the voter's intent, for a specific contest vote, that office would be over-voted and no vote would be cast for that particular contest, but the remainder of the ballot would be counted in its entirety as long as the voter filled out the ballot correctly.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the ballot could be rejected during the counting process.

Mr. Nelson responded that the scanning devices had three output trays. He stated that one tray was for ballots needing additional adjudication or review by an individual Board. He clarified that the Board was not a single individual but a mix of individuals from the various political parties that would determine the intent of the voter.

Supervisor Miller inquired about the other output trays.

Mr. Nelson replied that one tray was for ballots that were read appropriately and the other tray was for ballots with write-in candidates. He stated that the write-in ballots were also sent to a Board for determination on whether that write-in candidate was legitimate.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether any of the workers had the ability to deploy an override button.

Mr. Nelson responded that there were no electronic devices available at precincts for them to deploy an override button. He stated that voters were provided instruction to address poll workers if a mistake occurred, because they had the ability to spoil the original ballot and provide a replacement.

Supervisor Miller clarified that she was questioning the override button on devices used by the workers at central count.

Mr. Nelson responded that they were not able to override because the trays were setup to assure that a physical determination was made by a Board that was comprised of mixed political parties.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether each ballot was sorted into one of the output trays.

Mr. Nelson responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Miller stated that her office had received complaints regarding the use of felt-tip pens, differing voting instructions and conflicting information provided by various entities. She inquired whether the County used a similar procedure for curing spoiled ballots during the counting process and whether those were available for review.

Mr. Nelson responded that the law required that the original and duplicate ballot be audited. He stated that it also required that a duplicate log be maintained in order to capture who made the changes and why.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the ballots were physically maintained.

Mr. Nelson responded in the affirmative. He stated that the ballots were marked accordingly and kept together with a document locator that tied the duplicate to the original.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the documents were available for examination and how many individuals, at the counting center, were involved in the duplication process.

Mr. Nelson stated that during the duplication process, a mix of political parties determined the intent of the voter on the rejected ballot and transferred that intent onto a duplicate ballot.

Supervisor Miller questioned whether the individuals had to be in agreement before any ballot was duplicated.

Mr. Nelson responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Miller inquired what process was used when they were not in agreement.

Mr. Nelson stated that the determination would be made by a Snag Board. He stated that the Snag Board was comprised of a representative from the political party, the Chair of the Accuracy and Certification Board, and the Elections Director.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether there were sufficient republican poll workers to fill all available slots.

Mr. Nelson stated that prior to the primary election, poll workers were needed from all party affiliations. He added that after the primary election they were inundated with individuals from all parties wanting to serve as poll workers.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether there were sufficient numbers for each of the two major parties.

Mr. Nelson responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Miller expressed concern over the mixed messages provided and asked why a variety of pen types were allowed to be used at the polls.



Mr. Nelson acknowledged the confusion between instructions and indicated that the information sent out with early ballot packages was provided by the Recorder's Office. He stated that he could not speak on their behalf, but indicated that those instructions might have been created prior to 2014, for the previous scanning system that required a particular ink color. He explained that the new scanning system had been tested by the County, individual political parties, and the Secretary of State. He indicated that sensitivity testing included testing different writing utensils such as pencils, pens and different colored ink. He stated that, to date, the system had not encountered problems with felt-tip pens. He added that it was not the prescribed pen, but the offered pen for individuals voting at the polls.

Supervisor Miller inquired if those pens were the only instruments provided at the polls.

Mr. Nelson responded that pens were placed in the voting booths; however, voters were allowed to use their own, especially due to COVID-19 concerns. He added that he had trained poll workers and they were instructed to allow voters to use their own writing instruments, including pencils.

Supervisor Miller stated that a congruent process was needed for areas due to the confusion experienced in Maricopa County. She stated it had caused distrust in the County's elections system. She indicated that until credibility was restored, issues were resolved and all doubt had been relieved, she would be voting against the canvass.

Supervisor Christy indicated his concurrence with Supervisor Miller's comments. He indicated that until assurances were provided to the voters that no fraud existed, he would also be voting against the canvass. He asked the Board to consider a hand recount or forensic audit of all ballots.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Christy and Miller voted "Nay."

## **INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

### **7. Berean Academy Refunding Project**

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - 91, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the proceedings of the Industrial Development Authority of the County of Pima regarding the issuance of its not to exceed \$9,000,000.00 Education Facility Refunding Revenue Bonds (Berean Academy Refunding Project, 1169 N. Colombo Avenue, Sierra Vista, AZ), series 2020 and declaring an emergency.

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Villegas and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

## **PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION**

8. The Board of Supervisors on September 15, 2020, continued the following:

### **Establishment of the Southeast Employment and Logistics Center Domestic Water Improvement District**

- A. Pursuant to A.R.S. §48-905(C), no public hearing is required for the establishment of the Southeast Employment and Logistics Center Domestic Water Improvement District.
- B. Upon finding that the petition has met the statutory requirements for establishment of the district, pass and adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - 74, of the Board of Supervisors, establishing the Southeast Employment and Logistics Center Domestic Water Improvement District of Pima County, Arizona.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Bronson to adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Miller stated that millions of dollars had already been invested on the Aerospace Parkway and expressed concern that this would be another project paid for by taxpayer monies. She indicated that due to the current economy, focus should be on developing infrastructure, and because individuals were struggling financially, this was not an appropriate approval at this time.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Miller voted "Nay."

## **FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

9. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 122520, Joey Jerome Danielson, Fast Market No. 4610, 5005 N. La Cañada Drive, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

Supervisor Bronson inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Miller and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

10. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 122551, Joey Jerome Danielson, Fast Market No. 4613, 15240 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

Supervisor Bronson inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Miller and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

## **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

### **11. Hearing - Zoning Code Text Amendment**

#### **P19TA00001, NEW SIGN STANDARDS, UPDATED ADDRESSING STANDARDS, AND A NEW DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE ROLE CONCERNING SIGNS**

A proposal to repeal and replace, by Ordinance, the existing Chapter 18.79 (Sign Standards) of the Pima County Zoning Code, with the exceptions of the billboard standards and the nonconforming sign standards (Section 18.79.060). The Section 18.79.060 nonconforming sign standards are not changed. The billboard standards retain the existing language but are reformatted and renumbered. Except for the nonconforming sign standards (Section 18.79.060) and billboard standards, the proposal replaces the repealed sign standards with new sign standards intended to update and clarify sign standards, reflect current sign technology and trends, encourage good sign design, and protect Dark Skies and scenic values. The new standards affect the size, height, illumination, location, and other features of the time, location and manner of signs. The proposal also 1) amends, by Ordinance, Pima County Zoning Code Chapter 18.83 (Address Standards), Section 18.83.050 (Address display) to update addressing standards consistent with state regulations; 2) amends Chapter 18.99 (Review Committees) Section 18.99.030 (Design Review Committee) to authorize the Design Review Committee to review and decide requests for the Master Sign Program; 3) amends sign-related cross references in Chapter 18.09 (General Residential and Rural Zoning Provisions), Section 18.09.030 (Home Occupations) to refer home occupation sign requirements to Chapter 18.79 (Sign Standards); 4) amends Chapter 18.40 (MR Major Resort Zone), Section 18.40.030 (Development Standards) to repeal an incorrect and unnecessary cross-reference to Chapter 18.79 (Sign Standards); 5) amends Chapter 18.45 (CB-2 General Business Zone), Section 18.45.030 (Permitted Uses) to repeal the listing of signs as a permitted use in the CB-2 zone (while signs are permitted in the CB-2 zone other zones that also allow signs do not individually list signs as a use); and 6) amends Chapter 18.77 (Roadway Frontage Standards), Section 18.77.030 (Setback Lines for Streets) to update a sign-related cross-reference. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 5-3 (Commissioners Gungle, Matter and Membrila voted Nay; Commissioners Bain and Becker were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE REVISIONS ON ATTACHMENT A AND RETAINING ELECTRONIC MESSAGE DISPLAY SIGNS AS A PROHIBITED SIGN TYPE. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE REVISIONS ON ATTACHMENT A AND RETAINING ELECTRONIC MESSAGE DISPLAY SIGNS AS A PROHIBITED SIGN TYPE. (All Districts)

If approved, pass and adopt: ORDINANCE NO. 2020 - 41

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services Department, indicated that this was a request to amend and update the County Zoning Code sign standards. He stated that in 2015, the Supreme Court ruled that sign codes had to be content neutral and could not contain different rules for different speech. He stated that the currently applied Code was adopted in 1985, and was far from content neutral and contained different standards for different words and messages. He indicated that the County needed to make significant changes and in order to incorporate those changes, they observed neighboring jurisdictions for several years to see what worked and then selected the more refined aspects to incorporate into their proposal for Code changes. He stated that the previous Sign Code was not content neutral and had to be reset to be effective and legal. He added that they tried not to impact the billboard rules. He indicated that stakeholders were engaged and after several drafts, they felt that a balanced and content neutral Code was being presented to the Board. He highlighted items taken under consideration and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission and staff recommended that electronic message signs remain prohibited. He indicated that the electronic message signs portion of the Code should be a standalone discussion with stakeholders because of the technological evaluation and should be held in conjunction with the electronic sign promoting industry. He highlighted key issues such as agreement that the most commonly occurring sign type would be the free standing commercial sign. He indicated that originally it was proposed that the sign area be 64 feet, but stakeholders felt that the increase was too significant and they were recommending that commercially zoned areas remain the same. He stated that another consideration was adding criteria, with regards to sign brightness, to further enhance the dark skies option.

Thomas Drzazgowski, Chief Zoning Inspector, Development Services Department, stated that this process was unique because outreach started prior to drafting any text and that resulted in multiple meetings and draft changes. He indicated that staff was responsive to the stakeholders by responding to a memo containing 41 quantifiable code changes. He stated that the requested updates were reviewed by staff and they were able to offer 35 changes that either matched or were compromised options to what was requested. He indicated that as a result of that, one of the major changes was the change to residential areas for business uses. He explained that SR, SR-2 and CR-1 zones were backtracked to the current Code allowed, so that the impact on adjoining residential properties remained the same. He stated that the recent changes resulted in changing the current existing Code for existing business standards based on street frontage length. He indicated that the dark skies option had been refined to provide a 100nit brightness output limit and a 3000k color temperature limit on signs that received the additional square footage and height increase. He added that they had received positive feedback from the Small Business Commission, M.P.A., Tucson Metro Chamber and Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SABHA).

Supervisor Miller inquired about the types of signs that were prohibited and why.

Mr. Poirier responded that they were similar to message signs, seen in storefronts, that could be changed from a computer. He indicated that under the current Code

they were not allowed unless a variance had been approved. He stated that consideration was given to allow those sign types, but after significant concerns from stakeholders they decided against it.

Supervisor Miller inquired about the cost of a variance.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded a variance cost \$1,300.00 and added that these were presented to the Board of Adjustment for approval or denial. He indicated that other jurisdictions, City of Tucson, Town of Marana and Sahuarita, allowed for different electronic message sign options, but staff had decided that the County should maintain prohibition and deal with these separately with stakeholder participation.

Supervisor Miller expressed concern over the negative impact the fee would have on small businesses and recommended that the changes not be made. She asked for an explanation of the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Poirier responded that it was an administrative process designed to allow an entity or developer to request modifications without having to go through the traditional rezoning process. He indicated that it was used by the City of Tucson and according to the sign industry was an effective option and tool.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the Master Sign Program was specifically for developer use.

Mr. Poirier responded that it was for developers and stakeholders and could also be used by other organizations.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the program allowed variance approvals for electronic signs.

Mr. Poirier responded that prohibited sign types were not allowed to achieve that benefit from the program.

Supervisor Miller asked what were the differences between Tier One and Tier Two.

Mr. Poirier responded that the differences were a limit on administrative increases that could be given. He asked Mr. Drzazgowski to clarify further.

Mr. Drzazgowski explained that the Tier One option was for small scale changes and the main benefit was the portability it provided. He stated the other scenario for Tier One was with right-of-way signs that currently had no accountability or permitting standards. He stated that this resulted in organization representatives going through the review for their members and then standards were provided by staff that required adherence to safety aspects and traffic visibility. He stated that they would then be issued an approval for the Master Sign Program and each of their users would be given a set of standards that allowed them to place their signs in accordance with what was approved. He stated that Tier Two was for larger options. He indicated that these were referred to the Design Review Committee for

approval. He added that the process also involved Transportation and Development Services, architects, engineers and land planners from the private sector.

Supervisor Miller asked whether portability meant signs used by realtors.

Mr. Poirier responded in the affirmative and stated that it was for minor design related requests and used to allow individuals the ability to spread out area allowances.

Supervisor Miller inquired about the letters of opposition and what reasons were given for their opposition.

Mr. Poirier responded that the electronic message sign raised concerns from astronomers because it was relatively new technology. He indicated that another concern was allowing additional signs which caused blight and increased light pollution.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether those were the main concerns.

Mr. Poirier responded that those were the primary concerns. He stated that their focus was common sign types, which were the freestanding commercial, and dialing those back down to the current Code. He stated that he did not have an argument for allowing more signage because they were maintained at the same level. He stated that their intent was to eliminate confusion with regards to graduated signage by enforcing a 64-foot across the board standard. He indicated in some cases signage was reduced, but in other cases it was increased. He indicated that the situation that recurred most was increased signage for small businesses that were placed at the entrances to shopping centers. He stated that this recommendation brought down the blight and sign light pollution to its current standard. He stated that they focused on enhancing the dark skies option. He indicated that criteria from the International Dark Skies Communities Program guidelines was inserted into the Code adding further refinements for the Board's approval.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether all of the concerns were addressed.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that with the added changes they felt they had addressed the primary concerns. He indicated that the Code being presented benefited the business community, while protecting the critical astronomy aspect.

Supervisor Miller asked when the department would be addressing electronic messaging signs.

Mr. Poirier responded that he hoped to address that issue soon, but indicated that discussions with the electronic message sign industry needed to be completed before presentation to the Board. He stated that the industry had standards for making those signs palatable to concerned stakeholders. He also indicated that they would like the industry to allow Development Services staff to shepherd them through the process.

Supervisor Christy asked which businesses, entities and stakeholders supported the amended and updated Sign Code.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that written letters of support were received from the Pima County Small Business Commission, M.P.A., Tucson Metro Chamber and SAHBA.

James Carpentier addressed the Board in support of the Code and recommended approval. He indicated that the only change he did not support was the dark skies option. He expressed pleasure with the Board's willingness to consider electronic message centers and that it was needed technology for providing emergency messaging. He strongly urged that the dark sky option remain the same because drastic changes should be done in concert with the industry stakeholders and the business community. He added that this was very different from what was in the outdoor lighting code.

Supervisor Miller asked for clarification on the proposed reduction in the dark skies option.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that it balanced the interests across the spectrum for stakeholders and it was critical to the astronomy community because they were concerned about light output. He explained that they balanced the business interests with protections for astronomers, by providing criteria that further limited brightness, it provided for increased height and square footage under this option. He added that without the light inputs, larger signs would generate more light and there were very limited light requirements. He indicated that going above reduced the color temperature, which benefited the astronomy community, and the nit output limited the brightness of signs that were larger than what was permitted by the Code. He added that those imitations were implemented for businesses that wanted to go above the 50 or 64 square footage currently in the Code.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the reduction was lower than what was currently allowed under the Code.

Mr. Poirier stated that the proposed changes only applied to the optional Dark Skies Program and did not apply to all signs.

Supervisor Miller asked whether the dark skies guidelines were more stringent than what was in the current Code.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Miller asked why they were more stringent.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that it balanced concerns raised by stakeholders, astronomers and the International Dark Skies Community. He indicated that staff was aware of the benefit of lower lit signs in dark communities, it allowed for greater visibility in the evenings. He added that standardization of a 10-foot height limit and zero setback provided a win/win situation.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether those choices were made by business owners.

Mr. Poirier responded in the affirmative. He explained that each sign was subjected to the Zoning Code and outdoor lighting requirements. He stated they this offered an incentive as it related to the dark skies option and it was an administrative process that did not include requirements from the Board of Adjustment. He added that this allowed the process to be quicker and less expensive and also allowed for increases in signage to be granted.

Mark Mayer, Scenic Arizona, addressed the Board in opposition to the adoption of the Sign Code. He stated more time was needed for review by community-based organizations. He added substantial improvements were made and it passed through the Planning and Zoning Commission with a minimal vote. He indicated that the items presented by the Sierra Club were not properly implemented.

Supervisor Miller inquired about the duration of processes and the number of stakeholder meetings conducted.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that the process started in October 2018. He indicated stakeholder meetings were conducted in order to obtain priorities and concerns. He stated that the first draft was released in 2020 and it continued to be refined as stakeholder input was received. He added that this continued through to November 16, 2020, where additional edits were proposed based on concerns received.

Supervisor Villegas expressed concern with the amount of time spent on revisions and she felt that this was being rushed which she based on the number of letters received in opposition. She indicated that although some concerns were addressed, community stakeholders and consumers still had concerns. She indicated that she would be voting no and asked that the item be continued until an agreeable draft could be provided.

Richard Green, University of Arizona Astronomer, Arizona Astronomy Consortium, indicated that County staff was proactive and responsive in addressing dark skies concerns. He indicated that they had presented concerns about electronic sign message displays, with current technology, abilities to send light above the horizon and shielding those lights had been the observatory's principle protection since the 1970's. He indicated that an additional concern was that the Sign Code and Lighting Code needed to be synced. He stated that with the dark skies option being more stringent, it avoided a conflict that might develop by imposing a sunset clause. He added that astronomy was a million-dollar industry in Tucson that helped the business community.



Supervisor Christy asked Mr. Green whether he supported the new sign standards as presented.

Supervisor Bronson asked that Supervisor Christy clarify his question and asked whether he was referring to the recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission or the recommendation within the Development Services memorandum.

Supervisor Christy responded that he was referring to all the revisions and recommendations.

Supervisor Bronson inquired whether it included the changes reflected in the memorandum.

Supervisor Christy responded that his question to Mr. Green was whether he supported either or both.

Mr. Green responded that by combining the items a majority of the concerns raised by the dark skies community had been addressed. He added that if the assigned Lighting Code was used in the way it was intended, the Dark Skies Community felt that a vast majority of their concerns were addressed.

Supervisor Christy commented that it appeared that the consensus was that the Code was acceptable, with the possibility of further revisions in the future.

Barbara Fleming addressed the Board in opposition to the Sign Code and stated that insufficient lead time was given for review. She asked that the item be continued to allow concerned residents an opportunity to fully review the proposal prior to Board approval. She asked that the Board direct staff to hold additional public meetings in order to incorporate public concerns.

Allyson Solomon, Executive Director, M.P.A., indicated that prior to the recommendations contained in the memorandum, she supported the proposed changes to the Code. She explained that the last minute changes had not been vetted by her organization. She indicated that there were serious concerns over policy recommendations being made without including input from those individuals that had worked on this process for two years. She indicated that without these recent modifications, it was a good, balanced Code that was usable for all of those involved.

Matt Somers addressed the Board in opposition to the Sign Code. He stated that the proposed sign codes were 20th century technology and using cell phones for advertising was 21st century technology. He indicated massive signage was not needed when cell phones were available. He stated that businesses were cluttering the communities with signs. He added that the community benefited financially through the Dark Skies Program.

Shawn Cody, SAHBA, stated that old-fashioned signs were critical to home builders and their ability to market and drive traffic to subdivisions. He indicated that the Master Sign Program was well-balanced with what other jurisdictions had implemented. He added that SAHBA was confident that it was a balanced Sign Code and supported approval.

Supervisor Christy asked that Ms. Solomon's concerns be addressed.

Mr. Poirier responded that the proposed changes could have a negative impact on the constituency of M.P.A.; however, the ability for increased signage was still an option. He indicated that organizations had the ability to pursue the administrative dark skies option or the sign program option, and staff anticipated that those options would be utilized frequently. He indicated that another change reverted the area of commercial signage to the current Code. He added that the change was respectful to both the business community and Scenic Arizona's concerns.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether there was flexibility within the amended recommendations to accommodate Ms. Solomon's concerns.

Mr. Poirier responded that no flexibility was available; but flexibility existed if they took advantage of requesting the needed extra area. He stated that businesses with sufficient frontage were going to benefit from this reduction. He stated that this was an incremental change with opportunity for businesses to achieve greater square footage.

Supervisor Christy asked that Supervisor Bronson clarify her concerns.

Supervisor Bronson stated that originally she had not heard from M.P.A. and the point of her concern was that staff had indicated overall acceptance. She indicated that her concerns were with last-minute changes that had not been thoroughly reviewed or vetted. She asked whether this item needed to be considered today. She also stated that there were lingering issues with the astronomy community that needed to be addressed and added that both speakers from SAHBA and M.P.A., were not comfortable with the newly proposed changes.

Supervisor Christy commented that his understanding was that SAHBA favored everything presented and M.P.A. had reservations.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether revisions were made in order to satisfy organizational opposition.

Mr. Poirier responded that there had been a lot of focus and emphasis on a certain sign type, the old commercial free standing 50-foot sign, now being proposed at 64-feet. He stated that this was a neutral dial-back and that in some circumstances, businesses with enough frontage were actually going to get 90-feet. He explained that the entire Sign Code needed to be replaced and there were difficulties in comparing the new with the old because they were very different. He added that there was still room for adjustment and fairness.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether staff felt that the proposed Sign Code was easily understood and easier for enforcement purposes. She asked Mr. Cody to clarify whether SAHBA supported the Code.

Mr. Cody responded in the affirmative and stated that SAHBA was supportive of the Code.

A motion was made by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Miller, to close the public hearing and approve P19TA00001, new sign standards, updated addressing standards and a new Design Review Committee role concerning signs, subject to the revisions on Attachment A and retaining electronic message display signs as a prohibited sign type. No vote was taken at this time.

Chairman Valadez inquired whether the motion excluded the November 16th memorandum.

Supervisor Christy responded in the affirmative.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, provided clarification to Supervisor Christy's motion. He explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission's approval included Attachment A's changes as well as the prohibition of the electronic message signs. He indicated that the Board also had staff's November 16th memorandum that held the sign square footage limitations to the current Code and introduced the nit and color temperature limitations.

Supervisor Christy amended his motion to include approval of the November 16, 2020 memorandum by staff and to adopt the Ordinance, as amended. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Miller. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Villegas voted "Nay."

## **PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER**

12. The Board of Supervisors on April 21, 2020 and September 1, 2020, continued the following:

### **Hearing - Pima County Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2020 - 13, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to animals; amending the Pima County Code, Title 6, Pima County Animal Code.

At the request of staff and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

13. The Board of Supervisors on April 7, 2020, April 21, 2020 and September 1, 2020, continued the following:

**Hearing - Fee Schedule**

ORDINANCE NO. 2020 - 12, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to animals; to adopt a fee schedule for licensing, shelter, veterinary care, and related services provided by the animal services department under Title 6 of the Pima County Code.

At the request of staff and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

14. **Renaming the Esmond Station Library**

Discussion/action, with the recommendation of the Library Advisory Board, numerous letters of community support, and the approval of the Library District and County Administration, this office requests the Pima County Board of Supervisors recognize the efforts of Anne Gibson by renaming the Esmond Station Library, 10931 E. Mary Ann Cleveland Way, the W. Anne Gibson-Esmond Station Library. (District 4)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Brett Anderson, President and C.E.O, The Greater Vail Area Chamber of Commerce, addressed the Board regarding Ms. Gibson's staunch support of the Vail community, and her involvement in numerous activities. He indicated that she had created a better environment in the Vail area.

Supervisor Christy conveyed his gratitude to Ms. Gibson for her commitment to the community and her decades of involvement in the fabric of the Vail/Corona de Tucson area. He stated that naming the library in her honor, was illustrative and worthy.

Anne Gibson expressed her love for the community and indicated that she was humbled by the recognition and looked forward to the opening of the library.

Heather Stone, Community Connections Director, Vail School District, stated that Ms. Gibson took great care of the people in the community and taught them how to make education a community effort.

Pam Kelty, Treasurer, Anne Gibson-Esmond Station Library, recognized Ms. Gibson as the inspiration for her own community involvement.

Carol Langford recognized Ms. Gibson's efforts in the community and indicated that the world was a brighter place because of Ms. Gibson.

Edward Buster, Representative, Library District Advisory Board, stated that Ms. Gibson deserved this recognition for her 80 years of steadfast dedication to the community, mentoring, molding and instilling needed values.

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

15. Elephant Head Volunteer Fire Department, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Elephant Head Volunteer Fire Station facility improvements, extend contract term to 12/31/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-CR-21-168)

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

16. Tucson Center for Women and Children, Inc. d.b.a. Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse, Amendment No. 1, to provide for safe, green and health energy-efficient facility improvements, extend contract term to 9/30/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-CR-21-167)

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

### **COUNTY ATTORNEY**

17. Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona Norton School, Amendment No. 1, to provide for evaluation services for Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Program and Specialty Courts Initiative, extend contract term to 9/30/21, amend contractual language and scope of services, U.S. Department of Justice and SAMHSA Treatment Drug Courts Funds, contract amount \$90,000.00 (CT-PCA-19-515)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

### **GRANTS MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION**

18. Downtown Tucson Partnership, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the COVID-19 Back 2 Basics Initiative, amend contractual language and scope of services, U.S. Department of Treasury, Coronavirus Relief Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT-GMI-20-444)

Supervisor Miller inquired whether grants would be available to businesses in unincorporated Pima County.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that grants were available and Requests for Proposals (RFP) had been issued for businesses in unincorporated areas, especially for small businesses. He indicated they were evaluating the submissions and would be awarded shortly. He stated that this contract was for the Business Improvement District which was managed by the Downtown Tucson Partnership. He stated that this would add monies to downtown businesses in the hopes of drawing people back to the downtown area.

Supervisor Miller inquired which department would be receiving the RFP's.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that requests should be submitted to the Grants Management and Innovation Department.

Supervisor Christy asked whether the initiative would be extended to all businesses within Pima County if it was successful.

Mr. Huckelberry responded in the affirmative. He stated that the current initiative was unique for the downtown area, and if it was successful it would be beneficial to the County's participation. He added that was a separate program for the unincorporated business areas.

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

#### **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

19. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the HIV Prevention Program and amend grant language, \$330,631.00 (GTAM 21-50)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

20. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for COVID-19 Complaint Referrals, \$50,000.00 (GTAW 21-81)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

#### **FRANCHISES/LICENSES/PERMITS**

21. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 121291, Anthony Peter Jacobsen, Catalina Craft Pizza, 15930 N. Oracle Road, No. 178, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

Supervisor Bronson inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Miller and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

### **22. Acceptance - Grants Management and Innovation**

The Tohono O'odham Nation, to provide for an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Tohono O'odham Nation and Pima County to Accept and Pass-Through 12% State-Shared Revenue Funds during Fiscal Year 2020-2021, \$1,000,000.00 (GTAW 21-83)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **23. Approval of the Consent Calendar**

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

\* \* \*

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Behavioral Health**

1. Santa Cruz County and Santa Cruz County Superior Court, to provide for restoration to competency services, contract amount \$390,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-BH-21-41)

### **County Attorney**

2. McEvoy, Daniels & Darcy, P.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for legal representation of Local Boards, extend contract term to 11/30/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-FN-15-284)

### **Health**

3. The Arizona Partnership for Immunization, Amendment No. 4, to provide for third party billing, extend contract term to 12/1/21 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$65,000.00 revenue (CTN-HD-19-77)

## **Real Property**

4. ComCapp Elevation, L.L.C., to provide for a License for Right-of-Way Encroachment for existing walls and a monument sign, contract amount \$16,550.00 revenue/25 year term (CTN-PW-21-47)

## **Regional Wastewater Reclamation**

5. Town of Marana, to provide for sewer billing and collection services, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$130,000.00/2 year term (CT-WW-21-224)

## **Sheriff**

6. Drug Enforcement Administration, to provide for a DEA Co-operative Agreement, no cost (CTN-SD-21-46)

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

7. **Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission**  
Appointment of Amanda Schreiber, to fill a vacancy created by Amanda Jean Monroy. Term expiration: 10/21/24. (Commission recommendation)
8. **Arizona Municipal Property Corporation**  
Reappointments of Stanley Lehman, John H. Payne, Diane Quihuis, Kenneth M. Silverman and Frank Y. Valenzuela. Term expirations: 11/19/21. (Corporation recommendations)

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

9. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**  
Maria Elena Amarillas Lerma \$29.00; Cobb Property Management, L.L.C. \$5,375.00; Northwest Exterminating Co. \$40.00.

## **TREASURER**

10. **Fill the Gap**  
Staff requests approval of the annual certification, as directed by A.R.S. §42-2421, that the five percent set-aside "Fill-the-Gap" funds in the amount of \$1,141,946.40 be transferred to the Local Courts Assistance Fund for supplemental aid to Superior and Justice Courts for processing of criminal cases.

## **RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

11. Minutes: October 20, 2020

\* \* \*



24. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

DRAFT



# OFFICIAL CANVASS

GENERAL ELECTION  
NOVEMBER 3, 2020

PIMA COUNTY ELECTIONS DEPARTMENT  
6550 S. COUNTRY CLUB ROAD  
TUCSON, AZ 85756  
TEL. 520-724-6830



**ELECTION  
SUMMARY**

Summary Results Report  
GENERAL ELECTION  
November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
Pima County

<b>Statistics</b>	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
Election Day Precincts Reporting	249 of 249	0	249	249
Precincts Complete	249 of 249	249	249	249
Precincts Partially Reported	0	0	0	0
Absentee/ Early Precincts Reporting	249 of 249	248	0	0
Registered Voters - Total	638,355			
Ballots Cast - Total	526,319	459,777	50,323	16,219
Ballots Cast - Blank	31	18	8	5
Voter Turnout - Total	82.45%			

Summary Results Report  
GENERAL ELECTION  
November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
Pima County

**PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BIDEN, JOE	304,981	282,457	15,246	7,278
TRUMP, DONALD	207,758	165,747	33,667	8,344
JORGENSEN	7,658	6,477	828	353
Write-In Totals	1,777	1,491	202	84
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>522,174</b>	<b>456,172</b>	<b>49,943</b>	<b>16,059</b>

**UNITED STATES SENATOR**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
KELLY, MARK	309,142	285,349	16,104	7,689
MCSALLY, MARTHA	207,317	166,149	33,284	7,884
Write-In Totals	1,175	971	144	60
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>517,634</b>	<b>452,469</b>	<b>49,532</b>	<b>15,633</b>

**U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, DIST. 1**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
O'HALLERAN, TOM	32,078	30,361	1,284	433
SHEDD, TIFFANY	37,473	30,972	5,404	1,097
Write-In Totals	77	62	10	5
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>69,628</b>	<b>61,395</b>	<b>6,698</b>	<b>1,535</b>

**U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, DIST. 2**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
KIRKPATRICK, ANN	185,657	173,806	8,212	3,639
MARTIN, BRANDON	136,179	109,985	21,311	4,883
Write-In Totals	542	440	79	23
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>322,378</b>	<b>284,231</b>	<b>29,602</b>	<b>8,545</b>

**U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, DIST. 3**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GRIJALVA, RAÚL	80,121	70,906	6,029	3,186
WOOD, DANIEL	34,808	27,032	6,065	1,711
Write-In Totals	192	162	18	12
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>115,121</b>	<b>98,100</b>	<b>12,112</b>	<b>4,909</b>

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 2**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GABALDÓN, ROSANNA	38,941	35,684	2,068	1,189
WORKMAN, MARK	27,840	23,183	3,732	925
Write-In Totals	129	100	23	6
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>66,910</b>	<b>58,967</b>	<b>5,823</b>	<b>2,120</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 3**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GONZALES, SALLY ANN	62,785	56,092	4,394	2,299
Write-In Totals	1,849	1,331	413	105
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>64,634</b>	<b>57,423</b>	<b>4,807</b>	<b>2,404</b>

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 4**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
OTONDO, LISA	7,735	6,253	1,105	377
ANGRY, TRAVIS	3,715	2,603	901	211
Write-In Totals	29	14	11	4
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>11,479</b>	<b>8,870</b>	<b>2,017</b>	<b>592</b>

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 9**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
STEELE, VICTORIA	83,482	77,191	4,533	1,758
Write-In Totals	3,086	2,316	651	119
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>86,568</b>	<b>79,507</b>	<b>5,184</b>	<b>1,877</b>

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 10**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
ENGEL, KIRSTEN	67,320	62,972	2,953	1,395
WADSACK, JUSTINE	47,394	38,100	7,537	1,757
Write-In Totals	218	161	44	13
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>114,932</b>	<b>101,233</b>	<b>10,534</b>	<b>3,165</b>

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 11**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
MENDOZA, JOANNA	37,169	35,013	1,619	537
LEACH, VENDEN "VINCE"	44,451	36,229	6,834	1,388
Write-In Totals	167	126	33	8
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>81,787</b>	<b>71,368</b>	<b>8,486</b>	<b>1,933</b>

**STATE SENATOR, DIST. 14**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
KARP, BOB	11,650	10,849	605	196
GOWAN, DAVID	18,953	14,725	3,457	771
Write-In Totals	45	28	12	5
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>30,648</b>	<b>25,602</b>	<b>4,074</b>	<b>972</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 2**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
DALESSANDRO, ANDREA	33,917	31,514	1,603	800
HERNANDEZ JR., DANIEL	35,195	32,413	1,771	1,011
MCEWEN, DEBORAH	28,449	23,837	3,702	910
Write-In Totals	460	393	62	5
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>98,021</b>	<b>88,157</b>	<b>7,138</b>	<b>2,726</b>

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 3**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
CANO, ANDRÉS	48,505	44,288	2,784	1,433
HERNANDEZ, ALMA	49,009	44,239	3,148	1,622
Write-In Totals	2,198	1,630	458	110
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>99,712</b>	<b>90,157</b>	<b>6,390</b>	<b>3,165</b>

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 4**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
FERNANDEZ, CHARLENE	7,531	6,087	1,078	366
PETEN, GERALDINE "GERAE"	5,702	4,752	721	229
JOHN, JOEL	3,571	2,540	842	189
Write-In Totals	76	58	15	3
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>16,880</b>	<b>13,437</b>	<b>2,656</b>	<b>787</b>

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 9**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
FRIESE, RANDALL "RANDY"	64,772	61,546	2,355	871
POWERS HANNLEY, PAMELA	64,781	61,400	2,408	973
LYONS, BRENDAN	48,026	39,300	7,102	1,624
Write-In Totals	795	634	140	21
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>178,374</b>	<b>162,880</b>	<b>12,005</b>	<b>3,489</b>

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 10**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
DEGRAZIA, DOMINGO	59,725	56,361	2,311	1,053
STAHL HAMILTON, STEPHANIE	59,344	56,016	2,309	1,019
GUMMERE, MABELLE	42,795	35,254	6,237	1,304
HICKS, MICHAEL	46,950	38,289	7,045	1,616
Write-In Totals	211	165	31	15
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>209,025</b>	<b>186,085</b>	<b>17,933</b>	<b>5,007</b>

Summary Results Report  
GENERAL ELECTION  
November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
Pima County

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 11**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
PEREZ, FELIPE R	37,646	35,445	1,645	556
FINCHEM, MARK	42,282	35,258	5,901	1,123
ROBERTS, BRET	42,824	35,864	5,872	1,088
Write-In Totals	365	333	22	10
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>123,117</b>	<b>106,900</b>	<b>13,440</b>	<b>2,777</b>

**STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 14**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BEACH-MOSCHETTI, KIMBERLY "KIM"	10,890	10,180	548	162
MAESTAS-CONDOS, RONNIE	9,763	9,164	470	129
GRIFFIN, GAIL	17,464	13,743	3,076	645
NUTT, BECKY	17,745	14,057	3,051	637
Write-In Totals	35	28	4	3
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>55,897</b>	<b>47,172</b>	<b>7,149</b>	<b>1,576</b>

**CORPORATION COMMISSIONER**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
MUNDELL, WILLIAM "BILL"	231,891	219,319	8,969	3,603
STANFIELD, SHEA	230,201	217,202	9,200	3,799
TOVAR, ANNA	263,380	246,033	11,993	5,354
MARQUEZ PETERSON, LEA	191,306	160,001	25,775	5,530
O'CONNOR, JAMES "JIM"	182,489	149,135	27,471	5,883
SLOAN, ERIC	172,046	142,389	24,585	5,072
Write-In Totals	1,152	898	176	78
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>1,272,465</b>	<b>1,134,977</b>	<b>108,169</b>	<b>29,319</b>

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DIST. 1**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
SCOTT, REX	66,565	63,260	2,441	864
SPAIN, STEVE	65,835	54,644	9,364	1,827
Write-In Totals	112	93	16	3
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>132,512</b>	<b>117,997</b>	<b>11,821</b>	<b>2,694</b>

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DIST. 2**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
HEINZ, MATT	48,153	43,567	2,913	1,673
SIZER, ANTHONY	22,885	17,770	3,961	1,154
Write-In Totals	110	86	18	6
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>71,148</b>	<b>61,423</b>	<b>6,892</b>	<b>2,833</b>



Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DIST. 3**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BRONSON, SHARON	51,823	47,233	3,217	1,373
SAUCEDO MERCER, GABBY	38,410	29,923	6,743	1,744
Write-In Totals	172	122	33	17
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>90,405</b>	<b>77,278</b>	<b>9,993</b>	<b>3,134</b>

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DIST. 4**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
DIAMOND, STEVE	57,813	54,755	2,150	908
CHRISTY, STEVE	69,292	57,146	9,906	2,240
Write-In Totals	173	140	16	17
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>127,278</b>	<b>112,041</b>	<b>12,072</b>	<b>3,165</b>

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DIST. 5**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GRIJALVA, ADELITA	56,266	51,287	3,191	1,788
GONZALES, FERNANDO	20,179	16,000	3,162	1,017
Write-In Totals	143	119	17	7
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>76,588</b>	<b>67,406</b>	<b>6,370</b>	<b>2,812</b>

**COUNTY ATTORNEY**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
CONOVER, LAURA	347,073	314,085	23,576	9,412
Write-In Totals	13,851	10,339	2,909	603
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>360,924</b>	<b>324,424</b>	<b>26,485</b>	<b>10,015</b>

**SHERIFF**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
NANOS, CHRIS	252,196	232,159	13,473	6,564
NAPIER, MARK	248,765	206,279	34,201	8,285
Write-In Totals	1,100	930	118	52
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>502,061</b>	<b>439,368</b>	<b>47,792</b>	<b>14,901</b>

**COUNTY RECORDER**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
CÁZARES-KELLY, GABRIELLA	289,932	267,777	15,055	7,100
WHITE, BENNY	203,631	164,910	31,492	7,229
Write-In Totals	539	406	88	45
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>494,102</b>	<b>433,093</b>	<b>46,635</b>	<b>14,374</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**COUNTY TREASURER**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BICKEL, BRIAN	244,843	226,543	12,344	5,956
FORD, BETH	250,713	207,905	34,425	8,383
Write-In Totals	518	358	104	56
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>496,074</b>	<b>434,806</b>	<b>46,873</b>	<b>14,395</b>

**COUNTY ASSESSOR**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
DROUBIE, SUZANNE	280,981	260,599	13,860	6,522
SABBAGH, JO ANN	206,470	167,014	31,897	7,559
Write-In Totals	889	654	170	65
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>488,340</b>	<b>428,267</b>	<b>45,927</b>	<b>14,146</b>

**COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
WILLIAMS, DUSTIN	354,841	320,043	24,698	10,100
Write-In Totals	14,676	11,010	3,020	646
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>369,517</b>	<b>331,053</b>	<b>27,718</b>	<b>10,746</b>

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 2**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
CORNEJO, ERICA	29,723	26,434	2,127	1,162
Write-In Totals	964	727	182	55
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>30,687</b>	<b>27,161</b>	<b>2,309</b>	<b>1,217</b>

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 4**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
PESQUIERA, CHARLENE	39,786	35,470	2,953	1,363
Write-In Totals	1,170	818	279	73
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>40,956</b>	<b>36,288</b>	<b>3,232</b>	<b>1,436</b>

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 6**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BALL, ALEXANDER	42,246	37,857	3,067	1,322
Write-In Totals	1,548	1,079	389	80
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>43,794</b>	<b>38,936</b>	<b>3,456</b>	<b>1,402</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 9**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
WILSON, KENDRICK A.	32,285	28,385	2,399	1,501
Write-In Totals	515	368	116	31
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>32,800</b>	<b>28,753</b>	<b>2,515</b>	<b>1,532</b>

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 10**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
ROBERTS, VINCE	38,356	32,698	4,547	1,111
Write-In Totals	717	661	41	15
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>39,073</b>	<b>33,359</b>	<b>4,588</b>	<b>1,126</b>

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 1**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
DORER, JOHN	51,328	44,959	5,260	1,109
Write-In Totals	1,510	1,414	72	24
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>52,838</b>	<b>46,373</b>	<b>5,332</b>	<b>1,133</b>

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 4**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
VASQUEZ, OSCAR	38,611	34,403	2,882	1,326
Write-In Totals	1,297	947	282	68
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>39,908</b>	<b>35,350</b>	<b>3,164</b>	<b>1,394</b>

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 6**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BERNAL, BENNETT L.	43,644	39,184	3,136	1,324
Write-In Totals	1,594	1,133	377	84
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>45,238</b>	<b>40,317</b>	<b>3,513</b>	<b>1,408</b>

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 7**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
SCHENEK JR., THOMAS	35,259	30,124	4,200	935
Write-In Totals	922	850	54	18
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>36,181</b>	<b>30,974</b>	<b>4,254</b>	<b>953</b>

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 8**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
RANDALL, KRISTEN	30,515	27,853	1,840	822
Write-In Totals	820	595	189	36
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>31,335</b>	<b>28,448</b>	<b>2,029</b>	<b>858</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 9**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
CAMACHO, GEORGE	32,943	28,952	2,450	1,541
Write-In Totals	734	585	118	31
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>33,677</b>	<b>29,537</b>	<b>2,568</b>	<b>1,572</b>

**CONSTABLE, JUSTICE PRECINCT 10**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
STEVENSON, MICHAEL	37,805	32,221	4,499	1,085
Write-In Totals	662	618	28	16
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>38,467</b>	<b>32,839</b>	<b>4,527</b>	<b>1,101</b>

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS - PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NO. 1**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
ORR, ETHAN	40,692	35,107	4,732	853
RIPLEY, CATHERINE	59,166	54,569	3,541	1,056
Write-In Totals	521	372	122	27
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>100,379</b>	<b>90,048</b>	<b>8,395</b>	<b>1,936</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD - TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GRIVOIS-SHAH, RAVI	76,566	71,738	3,510	1,318
LUNA ROSE, NATALIE	108,477	98,677	6,719	3,081
PIERSON, JOE NICOLAS	49,912	42,896	5,384	1,632
RAGAN, ADAM	72,229	65,443	5,244	1,542
SHAW, SADIE	80,898	73,504	5,369	2,025
WINSTON, CINDY M.	63,410	56,654	4,991	1,765
Write-In Totals	4,507	3,744	617	146
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>455,999</b>	<b>412,656</b>	<b>31,834</b>	<b>11,509</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD - AMPHITHEATER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 10**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BAKER, SCOTT K.	31,609	28,516	2,499	594
COX GOLDR, VICKI L.	33,995	30,619	2,711	665
DAVIS, NATHAN	31,029	28,270	2,185	574
DAY, DEANNA M.	37,534	34,316	2,521	697
Write-In Totals	852	687	127	38
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>135,019</b>	<b>122,408</b>	<b>10,043</b>	<b>2,568</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**GOVERNING BOARD - SUNNYSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
NUÑEZ, JOAQUIN M.	10,283	8,968	823	492
NUÑEZ, LISETTE	13,017	11,504	962	551
QUINTERO, REBECCA "BEKI"	14,133	12,583	971	579
TAYLOR, MATTHEW	9,562	8,434	769	359
Write-In Totals	330	241	63	26
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>47,325</b>	<b>41,730</b>	<b>3,588</b>	<b>2,007</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD - TANQUE VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 13**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
MURTHY, RAJ	2,900	2,622	239	39
NEFF, JEFFREY M.	4,242	3,764	416	62
SCHALK, JEREMY L.	3,492	3,142	311	39
VELOSA, ANNE	4,592	4,169	366	57
Write-In Totals	114	99	15	0
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>15,340</b>	<b>13,796</b>	<b>1,347</b>	<b>197</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD - AJO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 15**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GUTHRIE JR., LONNIE D.	566	463	90	13
KRZARNICH, ERIC F.	523	405	102	16
MORALES, LORENZO "DAN"	394	333	50	11
RAMIREZ, PAULA L.	421	369	46	6
Write-In Totals	8	6	1	1
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>1,912</b>	<b>1,576</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>47</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD 2-YEAR TERM - AJO UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST. 15**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
ROBERTSON, WINDY	889	730	136	23
Write-In Totals	23	20	2	1
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>24</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD - VAIL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
FARGUSSON, KIM	10,320	8,805	1,177	338
KING, CHRISTOPHER	12,835	10,607	1,803	425
MIXON, ANDRÉ P.	11,971	10,716	1,029	226
PRATT, ALLISON	19,888	17,333	2,056	499
TIPPETT, CALLIE B.	18,683	16,572	1,712	399
Write-In Totals	513	417	88	8
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>74,210</b>	<b>64,450</b>	<b>7,865</b>	<b>1,895</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**GOVERNING BOARD - CONTINENTAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DIST. 39**

Vote For 3

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
MCGIBBON, ANDREW W.	13,064	12,293	641	130
ULERY, RICHARD R.	12,348	11,617	614	117
Write-In Totals	2,509	2,305	177	27
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>27,921</b>	<b>26,215</b>	<b>1,432</b>	<b>274</b>

**GOVERNING BOARD 2-YEAR TERM - CONTINENTAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DIST. 39**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
KAIS, SHELLEY	14,432	13,502	780	150
Write-In Totals	375	335	34	6
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>14,807</b>	<b>13,837</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>156</b>

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS - MARANA DOMESTIC WATER IMPROVEMENT**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
SOSTARICH, ANNETTE	656	520	102	34
Write-In Totals	69	51	16	2
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>36</b>

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS - WHY DOMESTIC WATER IMPROVEMENT**

Vote For 2

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
GEORGE, WALTER	36	28	8	0
HOOD, LINDA	52	38	14	0
MCELWAIN, GRANT	25	19	5	1
Write-In Totals	3	3	0	0
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>

**BRUTINEL, ROBERT - JUSTICE OF THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	298,590	262,673	27,287	8,630
NO	107,603	94,074	10,177	3,352
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>406,193</b>	<b>356,747</b>	<b>37,464</b>	<b>11,982</b>

**GOULD, ANDREW W. - JUSTICE OF THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	261,865	228,246	25,539	8,080
NO	135,356	120,980	10,861	3,515
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>397,221</b>	<b>349,226</b>	<b>36,400</b>	<b>11,595</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**LOPEZ IV, JOHN - JUSTICE OF THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	287,126	251,790	26,680	8,656
NO	117,571	104,021	10,393	3,157
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>404,697</b>	<b>355,811</b>	<b>37,073</b>	<b>11,813</b>

**BREARCLIFFE, SEAN - JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION 2**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	278,494	243,143	26,872	8,479
NO	124,860	111,229	10,222	3,409
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>403,354</b>	<b>354,372</b>	<b>37,094</b>	<b>11,888</b>

**GRIFFIN, BRENDEN J - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	301,180	265,545	26,969	8,666
NO	96,777	83,769	9,854	3,154
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>397,957</b>	<b>349,314</b>	<b>36,823</b>	<b>11,820</b>

**LEE, KENNETH - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	307,266	272,173	26,604	8,489
NO	88,127	75,194	9,743	3,190
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>395,393</b>	<b>347,367</b>	<b>36,347</b>	<b>11,679</b>

**BRYSON, KYLE A. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	308,065	273,367	26,354	8,344
NO	86,057	72,917	9,838	3,302
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>394,122</b>	<b>346,284</b>	<b>36,192</b>	<b>11,646</b>

**GORDON, RICHARD E. JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	295,842	261,578	25,942	8,322
NO	96,049	82,746	10,024	3,279
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>391,891</b>	<b>344,324</b>	<b>35,966</b>	<b>11,601</b>

**BUTLER, MICHAEL J. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	289,025	255,388	25,366	8,271
NO	102,381	88,507	10,569	3,305
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>391,406</b>	<b>343,895</b>	<b>35,935</b>	<b>11,576</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**YEHLING, WAYNE E - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	297,914	264,629	25,172	8,113
NO	93,087	78,978	10,686	3,423
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>391,001</b>	<b>343,607</b>	<b>35,858</b>	<b>11,536</b>

**BERNINI, DEBORAH - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	313,748	279,088	26,166	8,494
NO	79,965	67,078	9,791	3,096
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>393,713</b>	<b>346,166</b>	<b>35,957</b>	<b>11,590</b>

**BENNETT, RENEE T. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	291,508	257,406	25,753	8,349
NO	96,908	83,817	10,013	3,078
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>388,416</b>	<b>341,223</b>	<b>35,766</b>	<b>11,427</b>

**METCALF, D. DOUGLAS - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	298,005	264,508	25,318	8,179
NO	92,271	78,521	10,412	3,338
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>390,276</b>	<b>343,029</b>	<b>35,730</b>	<b>11,517</b>

**MCGINLEY, CASEY F. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	296,725	262,416	26,031	8,278
NO	94,180	81,216	9,735	3,229
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>390,905</b>	<b>343,632</b>	<b>35,766</b>	<b>11,507</b>

**SAKALL, GREG - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	298,658	265,011	25,592	8,055
NO	91,524	77,957	10,144	3,423
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>390,182</b>	<b>342,968</b>	<b>35,736</b>	<b>11,478</b>

**WAGENER, JOAN L. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	298,206	264,142	25,757	8,307
NO	92,469	79,256	10,028	3,185
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>390,675</b>	<b>343,398</b>	<b>35,785</b>	<b>11,492</b>



Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**HINDERAKER, JOHN CHARLES - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	284,667	251,116	25,516	8,035
NO	105,279	91,711	10,159	3,409
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>389,946</b>	<b>342,827</b>	<b>35,675</b>	<b>11,444</b>

**JOHNSON, KELLIE L. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	308,455	273,659	26,337	8,459
NO	82,567	70,100	9,452	3,015
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>391,022</b>	<b>343,759</b>	<b>35,789</b>	<b>11,474</b>

**TANG, PAUL E. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	267,076	234,332	24,688	8,056
NO	127,230	112,484	11,264	3,482
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>394,306</b>	<b>346,816</b>	<b>35,952</b>	<b>11,538</b>

**MCDONALD, SCOTT D. - JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	296,061	261,498	26,218	8,345
NO	96,020	83,118	9,696	3,206
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>392,081</b>	<b>344,616</b>	<b>35,914</b>	<b>11,551</b>

**PROPOSITION 207**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	313,906	279,176	25,601	9,129
NO	177,698	152,716	20,908	4,074
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>491,604</b>	<b>431,892</b>	<b>46,509</b>	<b>13,203</b>

**PROPOSITION 208**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
YES/SÍ	294,834	270,202	17,620	7,012
NO	193,295	159,151	28,222	5,922
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>488,129</b>	<b>429,353</b>	<b>45,842</b>	<b>12,934</b>

**PROPOSITION 481 - PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISION AL
BASE EXPENDITURE LIMIT ADJUSTMENT, YES	320,787	289,864	23,268	7,655
BASE EXPENDITURE LIMIT ADJUSTMENT, NO	143,146	119,058	19,682	4,406
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>463,933</b>	<b>408,922</b>	<b>42,950</b>	<b>12,061</b>

Summary Results Report  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 November 3, 2020

UNOFFICIAL RESULTS  
 Pima County

**PROPOSITION 482 - MARANA USD NO. 6**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISIONAL
BUDGET OVERRIDE CONTINUATION, YES	30,799	26,997	2,971	831
BUDGET OVERRIDE CONTINUATION, NO	24,055	20,086	3,302	667
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>54,854</b>	<b>47,083</b>	<b>6,273</b>	<b>1,498</b>

**PROPOSITION 483 - TANQUE VERDE USD NO. 13**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISIONAL
BOND APPROVAL, YES	4,428	4,027	331	70
BOND APPROVAL, NO	3,614	3,056	503	55
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>8,042</b>	<b>7,083</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>125</b>

**PROPOSITION 484 - CONTINENTAL ESD NO. 39**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISIONAL
BUDGET OVERRIDE CONTINUATION, YES	12,517	11,858	544	115
BUDGET OVERRIDE CONTINUATION, NO	7,474	6,735	635	104
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>19,991</b>	<b>18,593</b>	<b>1,179</b>	<b>219</b>

**PROPOSITION 485 - GREEN VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISIONAL
FOR THE BONDS, YES	18,861	17,532	1,111	218
AGAINST THE BONDS, NO	4,362	3,867	415	80
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>23,223</b>	<b>21,399</b>	<b>1,526</b>	<b>298</b>

**PROPOSITION 486 - CITY OF SOUTH TUCSON**

Vote For 1

	TOTAL	EARLY	POLLS	PROVISIONAL
YES/SÍ	875	756	84	35
NO	362	314	31	17
<b>Total Votes Cast</b>	<b>1,237</b>	<b>1,070</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>52</b>